

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending. The independent claims are system claim 1, mobile terminal claim 3, and method claim 14.

Claims 10-13 are indicated to be allowable if put in independent form. Claim 10 is therefore now put in independent form, and also the word "means" is crossed out. These allowed claims relate primarily to the shared document memory described in FIG. 3 of the application.

Independent claims 1, 3, and 14 are rejected as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) from *Hill* (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,189). Regarding independent claim 14, the Office Action states at page 3, lines 7-8 that this claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim "2." However, Applicant assumes that this is a typographical error, and that actually claim 14 was rejected for the same reasons set forth regarding claim "1."

Regarding claims 1 and 3 (and also claim 14), the Office Action asserts (page 3, line 5; page 4, line 6) that the present claimed synchronization is "well-known" to persons skilled in the art. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present claimed type of synchronization is not known to persons skilled in the art, and therefore Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion that this feature of the present claimed invention would have been obvious. See MPEP § 2144.03 ("If the applicant traverses such an assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position").

According to an embodiment described in the specification (see page 17, lines 11-18 of the application), the master terminal is able to exclusively control a document while the document is made available to a slave terminal that cannot edit or otherwise control the document, but the slave terminal can look at the document even as the document synchronously changes under the control of the master terminal. The present independent claims disclose several of these defining features of the present invention, and it is not perceived that the *Hill* reference discloses anything that might render the present claimed invention obvious.

*Hill* is directed to a terminal that obtains desired information from another terminal instead of getting that information from a network server. There is nothing in *Hill* that suggests such information is in the form of a "document" or that the information can be controlled by one of the terminals while the document is shared (i.e. the document is shared synchronously). The Office Action points to column 4, lines 38-40 and column 5, lines 55-63 of *Hill* to show a shared document that is exclusively controlled by a master terminal, but those lines do not suggest that the document is shared synchronously.


Merely in order to expedite allowance, applicant now amends claims 1, 3, and 14 by specifying that the at least one slave terminal has a synchronous view of the document while the master terminal manipulates or updates the document. This limitation is supported at least by the last paragraph on page 2 of the application. Applicant submits that this limitation is already implied by the independent claims, but making it an express limitation even more clearly distinguishes the present invention from *Hill*.

### CONCLUSION

Early allowance of claims 1-15 is earnestly solicited. Applicant would be grateful if the Examiner would please contact Applicant's attorney by telephone if the Examiner detects anything in the present response that might hinder a speedy allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 17, 2004

  
Andrew T. Hyman  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 45,858

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER  
SLUYS & ADOLPHSON LLP  
Building Five, Bradford Green  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Telephone: (203) 261-1234  
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676  
USPTO Customer No. 004955